arXiv:physics/0702233v4 [physics.gen-ph] 13 Jan 2010

A THEORY OF FLAVOUR AND SET OF THE INTERACTION STRUCTURAL PARTS

Rasulkhozha S. Sharafiddinov

Institute of Nuclear Physics, Uzbekistan Academy of Sciences,
Tashkent, 702132 Ulugbek, Uzbekistan

At the availability of a sharp interconnection, the difference in sizes of Dirac and Pauli form factors of a massive neutrino must constitute their linearly ordered set. Such a class of currents can lead in the field of a spinless nucleus to the constitution of a partially ordered set of cross sections of polarized and unpolarized neutrino scattering. We discuss a theory, in which flavour conservation is predicted as a theorem about the equality of cross sections of the interaction with a gauge boson of leptonic current structural components. This theorem relates flavour and mirror symmetries as a consequence of unification of forces uniting the two left (right)-handed fermions in individual difermions. Thereby, it requires follow the logic of a truly nature of elementary particles from the point of view of a flavour dynamics of all types of the micro-world symmetry laws.

Owing to the unified nature of the most diverse types of interactions with virtual photon, the cross section of elastic scattering of neutrinos in the nuclear Coulomb field contains all necessary information for creation on their basis of a truly picture of this naturally united process. Here those aspects of phenomenon are highly interesting which give the possibility to understand the mathematical logic of fundamental structure of matter [1, 2].

According to the quantum electrodynamics, the lepton interaction with field of emission may be described in the form [3, 4] of vector V_l current

$$j_{em}^{V_l} = \overline{u}(p', s')[\gamma_\mu f_{1l}(q^2) - i\sigma_{\mu\lambda} q_\lambda f_{2l}(q^2)]u(p, s), \tag{1}$$

where $\sigma_{\mu\lambda} = [\gamma_\mu, \gamma_\lambda]/2$, $p(s)$ and $p'(s')$ imply the four-momentum (helicities) of a particle before and after the scattering, $q = p - p'$ is the momentum transfer.

The Dirac f_{1l} and Pauli f_{2l} form factors are responsible for the structure of the united Coulomb interactions as well as for their unified nature. From this point of view, they constitute a set of currents which may symbolically be written by following manner:

$$F_l^{V_l}(q^2) = \{f_{1l}(q^2), \quad f_{2l}(q^2)\}. \tag{2}$$

Its elements in the limit $q^2 \to 0$ define the static sizes of the electric charge and magnetic moment of the lepton

$$e_l = f_{1l}(0), \quad \mu_l = f_{2l}(0) \tag{3}$$

in units of the electron charge e and Bohr magnetons $\mu_B = e/2m_e$ respectively. In other words, f_{1l} and f_{2l} in each of sets (2) and

$$F_l^{V_l}(0) = \{f_{1l}(0), \quad f_{2l}(0)\} \tag{4}$$

have the different dimensionalities.

Insofar as a question about the unified theoretical description of both types of form factors is concerned, they can appear in the interaction structure dependence [5]. But their explicit form has not yet been established analytically. Therefore, it seems that $f_{2l}(0)$ describes the anomalous magnetic moment [6], and the lepton full magnetic moment is defined by the analogy [7] with form factors of the Sachs [8] for nucleons: $\mu_l^{full} = (f_{1l}(0)/2m_l) + f_{2l}(0)$.

However, in spite of a large number of works dedicated to the different aspects of the interaction between the lepton and field of emission, thus far no the unified sight at the nature of form factors in the behavior dependence of particles of the same flavour. In the first turn, this is explained by the absence of convincing approaches in the decision of problem from the point of view of a kind of the neutrino of each lepton.

To express the idea of any of such pairs at the fundamental dynamical level, one must establish a truly picture of the united interactions including a unified theoretical description of all types of lepton flavours.

For our purposes, it is desirable to elucidate whether there exists any ratio between the contributions of $f_{1l}(q^2)$ and $f_{2l}(q^2)$ to the interaction cross section with these currents, and if so what the observed connection says about the structure of sets (2), (4) and of flavour symmetry of elementary particles.

Here we investigate this highly important question studying in the elastic scattering on a spinless nucleus the ideas of each of the interaction structural components in the longitudinal case of polarization of leptons and their massive neutrinos.

The amplitude of the considered process on the basis of (1) may to the lower order in α be chosen as

$$M_{fi}^{em} = \frac{4\pi\alpha}{q^2}\overline{u}(p', s')[\gamma_\mu f_{1l}(q^2) - i\sigma_{\mu\lambda}q_\lambda f_{2l}(q^2)]u(p, s) < f|J_\mu^\gamma(q)|i >, \qquad (5)$$

where $l = e, \mu, \tau = e_{L,R}, \mu_{L,R}, \tau_{L,R}$ or $\nu_l = \nu_e^{L,R}, \nu_\mu^{L,R}, \nu_\tau^{L,R}$, J_μ^γ denotes the target nucleus [9] photon current.

The availability of the term $f_{1\nu_l}$ in (5) would seem to contradict gauge invariance. But unlike the earlier presentations about this symmetry, its mass structure [2, 10] allows to relate the mass to charge of the neutrino as a consequence of mass-charge duality [11].

At first sight, the latter violates the charge quantization law. On the other hand, as for the first time was noted in the work [12], any of electrically charged particles may serve as a certain indication to the existence of a kind of magnetically charged monoparticle. At this situation, the same mononeutrino must lead to quantization of electric charges of all neutrinos and vice versa.

Exactly the same one can as an example introduce an arbitrary charge. Such a procedure in the framework of the standard electroweak theory is, by itself, not excluded [13].

In the presence of massive Dirac neutrinos of a vector nature, the legality of conservation of summed charge in the decays of the neutron, proton, muon, tau lepton and in other processes with such neutrinos follows from the fact that in them appear [14, 15] dileptons

$$(l_L, \bar{\nu}_{lR}), \quad (l_R, \bar{\nu}_{lL}), \tag{6}$$

$$(\bar{l}_R, \nu_{lL}), \quad (\bar{l}_L, \nu_{lR}) \tag{7}$$

and paradileptons

$$\{(l_L, \bar{\nu}_{lR}), (\bar{l}_R, \nu_{lL})\}, \quad \{(l_R, \bar{\nu}_{lL}), (\bar{l}_L, \nu_{lR})\} \tag{8}$$

of a definite flavour [16, 17]:

$$L_l = \begin{cases} +1 & for \quad l_L, \quad l_R, \quad \nu_{lL}, \quad \nu_{lR}, \\ -1 & for \quad \bar{l}_R, \quad \bar{l}_L, \quad \bar{\nu}_{lR}, \quad \bar{\nu}_{lL}, \\ \ \ 0 & for \quad remaining \ \ particles. \end{cases} \tag{9}$$

It is not a wonder therefore that at the availability of the interaction (5), the elastic scattering cross section of leptons and their neutrinos on an electric charge of a nucleus must have the same compound structure:

$$\frac{d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l, s, s')}{d\Omega} = \frac{1}{2}\sigma_o^l(1-\eta_l^2)^{-1}\{(1+ss')f_{1l}^2+$$

$$+\eta_l^2(1-ss')[f_{1l}^2+4m_l^2(1-\eta_l^{-2})^2 f_{2l}^2]tg^2\frac{\theta_l}{2}\}F_E^2(q^2). \tag{10}$$

The index V_l implies that here no the axial-vector A_l currents, and

$$\sigma_o^l = \frac{\alpha^2 cos^2(\theta_l/2)}{4E_l^2(1-\eta_l^2)sin^4(\theta_l/2)}, \quad \eta_l = \frac{m_l}{E_l},$$

$$E_l = \sqrt{p^2+m_l^2}, \quad F_E(q^2) = ZF_c(q^2),$$

$$q^2 = -4E_l^2(1-\eta_l^2)sin^2\frac{\theta_l}{2},$$

where $F_c(q^2)$ is the charge distribution form factor ($F_c(0) = 1$) of a nucleus with number of protons Z, θ_l is the scattering angle of a particle, E_l and m_l are its energy and mass.

The existence of self interference contributions f_{il}^2 of each of the current Dirac ($i = 1$) and Pauli ($i = 2$) components for the scattering cross section

(10) is explained by the appearance in the nuclear charge field of the left - and right-handed [15] individual difermions:

$$(l_L, \bar{l}_R), \quad (l_R, \bar{l}_L), \tag{11}$$

$$(\nu_{lL}, \bar{\nu}_{lR}), \quad (\nu_{lR}, \bar{\nu}_{lL}). \tag{12}$$

As seen, left ($s = -1$) or right ($s = +1$) polarized fermion passing in the field of a nucleus suffers either conservation ($s' = s$) or flip ($s' = -s$) of his helicity. We can, therefore, replace the cross section (10) by summing size

$$d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l, s) = d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l, f_{1l}, s) + d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l, f_{2l}, s). \tag{13}$$

Charge and magnetic contributions have the values

$$\frac{d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l, f_{1l}, s)}{d\Omega} = \frac{d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l, f_{1l}, s' = s)}{d\Omega} + \frac{d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l, f_{1l}, s' = -s)}{d\Omega} =$$

$$= \sigma_o^l (1 - \eta_l^2)^{-1} (1 + \eta_l^2 tg^2 \frac{\theta_l}{2}) f_{1l}^2 F_E^2(q^2), \tag{14}$$

$$\frac{d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l, f_{2l}, s)}{d\Omega} = \frac{d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l, f_{2l}, s' = -s)}{d\Omega} =$$

$$= 4m_l^2 \sigma_o^l (1 - \eta_l^2) \eta_l^{-2} f_{2l}^2 F_E^2(q^2) tg^2 \frac{\theta_l}{2}. \tag{15}$$

In the same way making the averaging over s and summing over s', we can present (10) in the form

$$d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l) = d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l, f_{1l}) + d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l, f_{2l}), \tag{16}$$

where the Dirac and Pauli cross sections are equal to

$$\frac{d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l, f_{1l})}{d\Omega} = \sigma_o^l (1 - \eta_l^2)^{-1} (1 + \eta_l^2 tg^2 \frac{\theta_l}{2}) f_{1l}^2 F_E^2(q^2), \tag{17}$$

$$\frac{d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l, f_{2l})}{d\Omega} = 4m_l^2 \sigma_o^l (1 - \eta_l^2) \eta_l^{-2} f_{2l}^2 F_E^2(q^2) tg^2 \frac{\theta_l}{2}. \tag{18}$$

Thus, (13) and (16) would seem to say that incoming neutrinos either have the longitudinal polarization or are strictly unpolarized. This, however, is not quite so. The point is that a particle helicity properties depend not only on its charge and moment [5, 18] but also on the structure of medium [19], in which it moves. If unpolarized neutrino interacts with field of emission, the latter can polarize it over the spin. Therefore, it should be expected that among the incoming and outgoing fermions there are polarized as well as unpolarized particles. Then it is possible, for example, a flux of the scattered neutrinos is a partially ordered set of outgoing particles.

Their scattering on nuclei is described naturally by a set of corresponding cross sections. In the case of a nucleus with a zero spin and the neutrino of V_l currents, this class, according to (13) and (16), behaves as

$$\begin{aligned} d\sigma_{em}^{V_l} = \{ & d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l, f_{1l}, s), \quad d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l, f_{2l}, s), \\ & d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l, f_{1l}), \quad d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l, f_{2l})\}. \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

It of course becomes a partially ordered set [20] if between its two elements $d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l, f_{1l}, s)$ and $d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l, f_{2l}, s)$ takes place a relation

$$d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l, f_{1l}, s) \leq d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l, f_{2l}, s) \tag{20}$$

such that

1. $d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l, f_{1l}, s) \leq d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l, f_{1l}, s)$ (reflexivity),
2. $d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l, f_{1l}, s) \leq d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l, f_{2l}, s)$ and $d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l, f_{2l}, s) \leq d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l, f_{1l}, s)$ imply $d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l, f_{2l}, s) = d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l, f_{1l}, s)$ (antisymmetricality),
3. $d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l, f_{1l}, s) \leq d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l, f_{2l}, s)$ and $d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l, f_{2l}, s) \leq d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l, f_{1l})$ say $d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l, f_{1l}, s) \leq d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l, f_{1l})$ (transitivity).

One of bright features of form factors $f_{1l}(q^2)$ and $f_{2l}(q^2)$ is their interconnection which states that any dipole moment arises at the expense of a kind of charge [21]. As a consequence, each of elements of set (19) testifies in favor of the availability of all the remaining ones. Herewith a relation (20) is such that $d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l, f_{1l}, s) \leq d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l, f_{2l}, s)$ implies $d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l, f_{2l}, s) \leq d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l, f_{1l}, s)$ (symmetry). Therefore, if (20) satisfies the conditions both symmetricality and antisymmetricality, it must be relation of equality.

We note also that the cross sections (13) and (16) are not different:

$$\frac{d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l, s)}{d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l)} = 1. \tag{21}$$

It appears that here on the basis of (21) one can will individually compare the contribution of any of currents $f_{1l}(q^2)$ or $f_{2l}(q^2)$ to the cross sections of longitudinal polarized and unpolarized fermion scattering. However, similar comparison of (13) and (16) establishes the identity

$$\frac{d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l, f_{1l}, s)}{d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l, f_{1l})} = 1, \quad \frac{d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l, f_{2l}, s)}{d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l, f_{2l})} = 1 \tag{22}$$

and thereby predicts one more highly important regularity that class (19) with a partial order is partially ordered set, in which the symmetricality and antisymmetricality of relation (20) lead to a relationship implied from its transitivity. Such connections can appear in the class (19) even at the different permutation of elements. This reflects the characteristic features of their structure depending on nature of the corresponding mechanism responsible for unity of the interaction structural parts.

They indicate that between the contributions of $f_{1l}(q^2)$ and $f_{2l}(q^2)$ to the cross sections both in (13) and in (16) there exists the same equality, because of which the interratios of the possible pairs of elements in set (19) constitute four most diverse ratios.

To express the idea more clearly, one must apply to the two of them:

$$\frac{d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l, f_{2l}, s)}{d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l, f_{1l}, s)} = 1, \quad \frac{d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l, f_{2l})}{d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l, f_{1l})} = 1, \tag{23}$$

or to the two remaining equations.

An importance of such a choice follows from the fact that a non-zero interaction of Pauli is a consequence of the availability of a kind of the Dirac interaction. This unites all elements of the class (19) in a unified whole.

For further substantiation of their legality, we include in the discussion the united regularity that as in (20), a relation

$$d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l, f_{1l}, s) \sim d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l, f_{2l}, s) \tag{24}$$

between the elements $d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l, f_{1l}, s)$ and $d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l, f_{2l}, s)$ of the class (19) is a relation of equivalence [20] only in the case where it corresponds to the conditions

1. $d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l, f_{1l}, s) \sim d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l, f_{1l}, s)$ (reflexivity),

2. $d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l, f_{1l}, s) \sim d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l, f_{2l}, s)$ says $d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l, f_{2l}, s) \sim d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l, f_{1l}, s)$ (symmetricality),
3. $d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l, f_{1l}, s) \sim d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l, f_{2l}, s)$ and $d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l, f_{2l}, s) \sim d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l, f_{1l})$ imply $d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l, f_{1l}, s) \sim d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l, f_{1l})$ (transitivity).

Similar equivalence relation separates the set (19) to the possible subclasses so that they have no the same elements. We must therefore replace the class (19) to

$$d\sigma_{em}^{V_l} = \{d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l, s), \quad d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l)\}. \tag{25}$$

Its subsets reflect just a regularity that any of (13) and (16) constitutes his own set of cross sections:

$$d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l, s) = \{d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l, f_{1l}, s), \quad d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l, f_{2l}, s)\}, \tag{26}$$

$$d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l) = \{d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l, f_{1l}), \quad d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l, f_{2l})\}. \tag{27}$$

Both subclasses, as follows from (21), are strictly identical. Such a picture may be established only in the case when the scattering cross sections describe those processes, in which appear the same difermions of a vector or an axial-vector nature. Each neutrino in any of them, as we shall see below, possesses simultaneously only one of the C-invariant V_l or the C-noninvariant A_l currents [1].

There exists, however, the possibility that regardless of sizes of the interaction cross sections with field of a nucleus of unpolarized and longitudinal polarized fermions, their interratio for each lepton and its neutrino has the same value. In a given circumstance, (13) and (16) lead to the replacement of (21) to the following:

$$\frac{d\sigma_{em}^{V_{\nu_l}}(\theta_{\nu_l}, s)}{d\sigma_{em}^{V_{\nu_l}}(\theta_{\nu_l})} = \frac{d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l, s)}{d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l)}. \tag{28}$$

From point of view of the equations (22), this united state establishes the corresponding equations

$$\frac{d\sigma_{em}^{V_{\nu_l}}(\theta_{\nu_l}, f_{i\nu_l}, s)}{d\sigma_{em}^{V_{\nu_l}}(\theta_{\nu_l}, f_{i\nu_l})} = \frac{d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l, f_{il}, s)}{d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l, f_{il})} \tag{29}$$

and thereby describes a situation when the numbers of the same elements in the classes (26) and (27) for ν_l and l coincide.

The latter convinces us here that reflexivity, symmetricality and transitivity of an equivalence relation (24) hold regardless of a particle type, at which the interratio of any pair of elements from subsets (26) and (27) both for ν_l and for l consist of the same sizes. They have the crucial value for establishment of the four more most diverse relationships.

To elucidate their idea, it is desirable to use two of them:

$$\frac{d\sigma_{em}^{V_{\nu_l}}(\theta_{\nu_l}, f_{2\nu_l}, s)}{d\sigma_{em}^{V_{\nu_l}}(\theta_{\nu_l}, f_{1\nu_l}, s)} = \frac{d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l, f_{2l}, s)}{d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l, f_{1l}, s)}, \tag{30}$$

$$\frac{d\sigma_{em}^{V_{\nu_l}}(\theta_{\nu_l}, f_{2\nu_l})}{d\sigma_{em}^{V_{\nu_l}}(\theta_{\nu_l}, f_{1\nu_l})} = \frac{d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l, f_{2l})}{d\sigma_{em}^{V_l}(\theta_l, f_{1l})} \tag{31}$$

or the two remaining equations.

Furthermore, if we consider the case $E_l \gg m_l$ when $\eta_l \to 0$, and $q^2 \to 0$ implies $\theta_l \to 0$, the limit arising in (23) at the account of (14), (15), (17) and (18) has the size

$$lim_{\eta_l \to 0, \theta_l \to 0} \frac{\eta_l^2(1+\eta_l^2 tg^2(\theta_l/2))}{(1-\eta_l^2)^2 tg^2(\theta_l/2)} = 1$$

owing to which, the latter equation take an explicit form [15, 21]

$$2m_l \frac{f_{2l}(0)}{f_{1l}(0)} = \pm 1. \tag{32}$$

Unification of (32) with (3) suggests a connection

$$f_{2l}(0) = \frac{f_{1l}(0)}{2m_l} = \frac{e_l}{2m_l} \tag{33}$$

and that, consequently, f_{2l} gives the normal magnetic moment of a Dirac particle [22]. Insofar as the anomalous components of its currents are concerned, they appear in the processes with exchange by the two bosons.

Thus, using (17), (18) and (22), we can relate on the basis of each of (30) and (31) the masses to a ratio of vector currents of any lepton and its neutrino. That gives the right to establish the same united dependence:

$$m_{\nu_l} \frac{f_{2\nu_l}(0)}{f_{1\nu_l}(0)} = \pm m_l \frac{f_{2l}(0)}{f_{1l}(0)}. \tag{34}$$

Comparison of (34) with (33) at $l = \nu_l$ leads us once again to (32) confirming the fact that a possibility of the existence both of an individual and of the united connections of the structural components of vector cross sections in the lepton and its neutrino scattering is not excluded.

Returning to (30) and (31), we remark that each of them is based dynamically on the definite flavour. In other words, these connections correspond in nature to the coexistence of leptons and their neutrinos. As a consequence, the presence of any type of charge lepton implies the existence of a kind of the Dirac neutrino. Such C-invariant pairs constitute the naturally united families of the left - and right-handed leptons. Therefore, all elements of a set (19) answer to one of spin states of paraneutrinos, because of which the structural components of cross sections (13) and (16) coincide. Thereby, they show that between the two particles of each of difermions (11) and (12) there exists a hard flavour symmetrical interconnection [1, 15].

This principle is not changed [1] even at the interaction with virtual photon of an axial-vector A_l current

$$j_{em}^{A_l} = \overline{u}(p', s')\gamma_5[\gamma_\mu g_{1l}(q^2) - i\sigma_{\mu\lambda}q_\lambda g_{2l}(q^2)]u(p, s). \tag{35}$$

In the framework of the recent presentations about the nature of fermions, the latter cosists of CP-symmetrical g_{1l} and CP-antisymmetrical g_{2l} parts of the different T-invariance with the same P-noninvariance. They define at $q^2 \to 0$ the static anapole [23] and electric dipole [24] moments:

$$a_l = \frac{1}{m_l}\left(\frac{g_{1l}(0)}{f_{1l}(0)}\right)^2 f_{2l}(0), \quad d_l = g_{2l}(0).$$

The existence of g_{1l} would imply also the absence of gauge invariance. However, according to the ideas of symmetry laws, g_{il} arise at the violation of P-parity as a consequence of mass structure of gauge invariance [2].

Finally, insofar as the weak neutral currents are concerned, they in a general form include the two components

$$j_{we} = \overline{u}(p', s')\gamma_\mu(g_{V_l} + \gamma_5 g_{A_l})u(p, s) \tag{36}$$

which are characterized by the vector g_{V_l} and axial-vector g_{A_l} constants.

From our earlier developments [5, 25], we find that the cross section in the studied processes with partially polarized fermions in the presence of all electroweak V_l and A_l currents (1), (35) and (36) contains not only their self interference contributions f_{il}^2, g_{il}^2, $g_{V_l}^2$, $g_{A_l}^2$, $g_{V_l}f_{1l}$ and $g_{A_l}g_{1l}$ but also the contributions $\lambda_c s f_{1l}g_{1l}$, $sf_{2l}g_{2l}$, $\lambda_c s g_{A_l}f_{1l}$ and $\lambda_c s g_{V_l}g_{1l}$ of the mixed interference between the two interactions of the vector and axial-vector nature [26]. The value of λ_c for a particle (antiparticle) has the positive (negative) sign. Its absence expresses, in the case of $f_{2l}g_{2l}$, the idea about that g_{2l} is C-invariant. But, as will be seen from the further, such an implication does not corresponds to reality at all.

At first sight, such mixedly interference parts of the cross section similarly to all self interference contributions describe the formation of one of the discussed types of parafermions. This, however, would have no any theoretical substantiation. The point is that the availability of the multipliers λ_c and s in them is incompatible with the invariance concerning C and P as well as with the above-mentioned equality of cross sections of polarized and unpolarized fermions. Thus, if (21) is valid only for particles of the definity type of lepton then flavour symmetry must be accepted as a mirror symmetry.

From the point of view of mass-charge duality [11], f_{il} and g_{il} constitute the vector V_l and axial-vector A_l parts of the same Dirac or Pauli component of leptonic current: $j_{em} = j_{em}^{V_l} + j_{em}^{A_l}$. In other words, the dipole moments f_{2l} and g_{2l} correspond in it to a vector f_{1l} and to an axial-vector g_{1l} charges [1].

It is clear, however, that any C-even or C-odd charge may serve as the source of a kind of the dipole [22]. Such a correspondence principle expresses the CP-invariance as well as the C-antisymmetricality of the electric dipole moment. Therefore, we not only deny from the CPT-symmetry of all types of the C-noninvariant A_l currents even at the violation of T-parity of the CP-symmetrical anapole itself but also need to go away from the earlier descriptions of nature of leptons taking into account that the same neutrino may not be simultaneously both a C-even and a C-odd fermion [1, 2].

In these circumstances, appears of principle possibility to separate all leptons into the two classes. To the first of them apply the vector C-invariant particles. They have no axial-vector interactions. A beautiful example is vector V leptons ($l^V \neq \bar{l}^V$) and their Dirac neutrinos ($\nu_l^V \neq \bar{\nu}_l^V$) with V_l currents. The second class consists of the C-noninvariant axial-vector particles. In them, the vector properties are absent. We include in this group the truly neutral Majorana ($\nu_M = \bar{\nu}_M$) neutrinos [27]. As was, however, for the first time noted by the author [2], each of these types of neutrinos must have his own Dirac neutrino corresponding in nature to a kind of charged lepton. In a given case, a new example of the second group may be axial-vector A leptons ($l^A = \bar{l}^A$) and their Dirac ($\nu_l^A = \bar{\nu}_l^A$) neutrinos with A_l currents. Such a sight at the behavior of fermions leads us to a correspondence principle that

$$l^V = e^V, \mu^V, \tau^V, ... \rightarrow \nu_l^V = \nu_e^V, \nu_\mu^V, \nu_\tau^V, ..., \tag{37}$$

$$l^A = e^A, \mu^A, \tau^A, ... \rightarrow \nu_l^A = \nu_e^A, \nu_\mu^A, \nu_\tau^A, ..., \tag{38}$$

$$\nu_D^A = \nu_e^A, \nu_\mu^A, \nu_\tau^A, ... \rightarrow \nu_M^A = \nu_1^A, \nu_2^A, \nu_3^A, ... \tag{39}$$

The difference in nature of truly neutral neutrinos of Dirac ($\nu_D^A = \bar{\nu}_D^A$) and Majorana ($\nu_M^A = \bar{\nu}_M^A$) types will be treated in our further works. But here we can use, for example, any of earlier experiments [28] about neutrino oscillations [29] as the reliable practical indication to the availability in all C-noninvariant particles of a kind of an axial-vector electric charge.

The presence both of $\nu_l^V(\bar{\nu}_l^V)$ and of $\nu_l^A(\bar{\nu}_l^A)$ in the field of emission leads to a formation not only of parafermions

$$(\nu_{lL}^V, \bar{\nu}_{lR}^V), \quad (\nu_{lR}^V, \bar{\nu}_{lL}^V), \tag{40}$$

$$(\nu_{lL}^A, \bar{\nu}_{lR}^A), \quad (\nu_{lR}^A, \bar{\nu}_{lL}^A) \tag{41}$$

of the same vector V or an axial-vector A nature but also the united systems of the two Dirac neutrinos of the different C-invariance

$$(\nu_{lL}^V, \bar{\nu}_{lR}^A), \quad (\nu_{lR}^V, \bar{\nu}_{lL}^A), \tag{42}$$

$$(\nu_{lL}^A, \bar{\nu}_{lR}^V), \quad (\nu_{lR}^A, \bar{\nu}_{lL}^V). \tag{43}$$

The interaction with a nucleus of each of paraneutrinos (42) and (43) violates, as has been mentioned above, the equality (21) expressing the idea of lepton number conservation law. Such a violation can explain once again the absence of earlier known lepton flavours for all types of truly neutral leptons and their neutrinos.

These reasoning give the right to interpret the flavour symmetry as a unification of the two left (right)-handed fermions in individual difermions of V_l or A_l currents.

So, we have learned that (22) and (23) similarly to any of (29)-(31) correspond in nature to the same flavour. In other words, they must be valid only for particles of the definite types of lepton numbers, at which a class (19) having a partial order becomes a partially ordered. Thus, flavour conservation in the elastic scattering one must consider as a theorem about the equality of cross sections of the interaction with field of emission of leptonic current structural parts.

According to one of the dynamical aspects of this theorem, each of equations (23) does not differ from unity and thereby it is assumed that either $f_{1l}(q^2) < f_{2l}(q^2)$ or $f_{2l}(q^2) < f_{1l}(q^2)$.

At these situations, sets (2) and (4) become a linearly ordered. But their all the elements may not be defined completely. There exists a range of uncertainties both in the behavior and in the structure of leptonic current. Another reason of incompleteness is the absence of a truly picture of phenomenon from the point of view of spin polarization. Nevertheless, taking into account the above-noted regularities of nature of fermions, we conclude that a linearly ordered class of a massive neutrino currents in the field of emission constitutes a partially ordered set of cross sections.

Thus, unlike the earlier principles of the united interactions, our theorem about unification of forces requires the establishment of nature of elementary particles in the flavour structure dependence of fundamental symmetry laws.

References

[1] R.S. Sharafiddinov, Fizika **B 16** (2007) 1; hep-ph/0512346.

[2] R.S. Sharafiddinov, Phys. Essays **19** (2006) 58; hep-ph/0407262.

[3] G. Feinberg and L.M. Lederman, Ann. Rev. Nucl. Sci. **13** (1963) 157.

[4] R.S. Sharafiddinov, Spacetime Subst. **5** (2004) 32; hep-ph/0306145.

[5] R.S. Sharafiddinov, Spacetime Subst. **3** (2002) 134; physics/0305015.

[6] J. Schwinger, Phys. Rev. **76** (1949) 790.

[7] B.K. Kerimov, T.R. Aruri and M.Ya. Safin, Izv.Acad. Nauk SSSR. Ser. Fiz. **37** (1973) 1768.

[8] R.G. Sachs, Phys. Rev. **B 136** (1962) 281.

[9] T.W. Donnelly and R.D. Peccei, Phys. Rep. **50** (1979) 3.

[10] R.S. Sharafiddinov, Spacetime Subst. **5** (2004) 83; hep-ph/0306255.

[11] R.S. Sharafiddinov, Spacetime Subst. **3** (2002) 47; physics/0305008.

[12] R.S. Sharafiddinov, Spacetime Subst. **3** (2002) 132; physics/0305014.

[13] I.S. Batkin and M.K. Sundaresan, J. Phys. **G 20** (1994) 1749.

[14] R.S. Sharafiddinov, in Proc. Aprel Meeting of the American Physical Society, Dallax, Texas, April 22-25, 2006, Abstract, H12.00009.

[15] R.S. Sharafiddinov, hep-ph/0511065.

[16] Ya.B. Zel'dovich, Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR. **86** (1952) 505.

[17] E.J. Konopinsky and H. Mahmoud, Phys. Rev. **92** (1953) 1045.

[18] R.S. Sharafiddinov, Dokl. Akad. Nauk Ruz. Ser. Math. Tehn. Estest. **7** (1998) 25; hep-ph/0307083.

[19] R.S. Sharafiddinov, hep-ph/0409254.

[20] R.R. Stoll, *Set Theory and Logic*, Mineola, New York, Dover Publications (1979).

[21] R.S. Sharafiddinov, Spacetime Subst. **1** (2000) 176; hep-ph/0305009.

[22] R.S. Sharafiddinov, Spacetime Subst. **3** (2002) 86; physics/0305009.

[23] Ya.B. Zel'dovich, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **33** (1957) 1531; Ya.B. Zel'dovich and A.M. Perelomov, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **39** (1960) 1115.

[24] L.D. Landau, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **32** (1957) 405; Nucl. Phys. **3** (1957) 127.

[25] B.S. Yuldashev and R.S. Sharafiddinov, Spacetime Subst. **5** (2004) 137; hep-ph/0510080.

[26] R.B. Begzhanov and R.S. Sharafiddinov, Mod. Phys. Lett. A 15 (2000) 557.

[27] E. Majorana, Nuovo Cimento **14** (1937) 171.

[28] Y. Fukuda et. al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **81** (1998) 1562.

[29] B. Pntecorvo, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **6** (1958) 429.